09/928,428   16
YO920010670US1
YOR.357

REMARKS

Entry of this §1.116 Amendment is proper as no new issues are being raised which would

require further search by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 20-22, 24-30, 32, and 34-50 are all the claims presently pending in

the application. A portion of claim 50 has been canceled and incorporated into their respective

independent claims.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 20-22, 24-30, 32, and 34-50 stand rejected on prior art grounds.

With respect to the prior art rejections, claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-17, 21-22, 24-25, 27-30,

32, 34-35, 37-48, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Charles

P. Pfleeger's "Security in Computing". Claims 20 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfleeger, and further in view of Friday, Wu, Schmid, Finney,

Cheverst and Davies, "A Wireless Public Access Infrastructure for Supporting Mobile

Context-Aware IPv6 Applications". Claims 7, 26 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Pfleeger, and further in view of Carl Landwehr's "Protecting

Unattended Computers Without Software".

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

It is noted that the claim amendments herein are made only for more particularly pointing

out the invention, and not necessarily for distinguishing the invention over the prior art,

narrowing the claims, or for any statutory requirements of patentability.

Further, it is noted that, notwithstanding any claim amendments made herein, Applicant's

intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements, even if amended herein or later during

prosecution. Thus, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be

09/928,428   17
YO920010670US1
YOR.357

construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of

the amended claim.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

Applicant's invention, as disclosed and claimed (e.g., as exemplarily defined in

independent claim 1) is directed to a method which includes receiving a request to present

information selected from a plurality of examples of information; reading an identification token

of at least one user; determining whether said user is authorized to be presented said information;

suppressing a confidential portion of a presentation of said information when said user is

determined not to be authorized, but allowing said user to view a non-confidential portion of the

presentation, and replacing a display of information on a screen with any confidential areas

missing.

In a second aspect, as defined by independent claim 9, the invention provides a method

which includes making a computing application available on a plurality of computing systems;

receiving a request to present said application on one of said computing systems, reading an

identification token of at least one user of said one of said computing systems, determining

whether said user is authorized to be presented said computing application, and allowing use of a

previous version of a software application when said user is determined not to be authorized,

wherein said software application comprises a specific version of a program written to perform a

specific task.

09/928,428   18
YO920010670US1
YOR.357

and presenting an alternate application when said user is determined not to be authorized, wherein said alternate application comprises a specific version of a program written to perform a specific task.

In a third aspect, as defined by independent claim 15, a method includes, presenting at least one information example selected from a plurality of examples of information;

reading an identification token of at least one user; determining whether said user is authorized to be presented said at least one information example; replacing a display of information on a screen with any confidential areas missing and presenting an alternate example of information when said user is determined not to be authorized; and presenting said information example on an alternate user interface device.

In a fourth exemplary aspect, as defined by independent claim 21, the invention provides a method, which includes receiving a request to present information selected from a plurality of examples of information; reading identification tokens from a plurality of users, determining whether any of said users are not authorized to be presented said information; and selectively suppressing a confidential portion of a presentation of said information to said any of said users determined not to be authorized, but allowing said any of said users to view a non-confidential portion of the presentation; and

replacing a display of information on a screen with any confidential areas when said user is determined not to be authorized.

In yet another exemplary aspect as defined by independent claim 28, the invention provides a method, which includes receiving a request to present information selected from a plurality of examples of information; detecting a presence of a user; determining whether said

09/928,428   19
YO920010670US1
YOR.357

user has an identification token that can be read; and selectively suppressing a <u>portion of a</u>

presentation of said information to any said user determined not to have said identification token

which can be read <u>such that a display of information on a screen includes any said confidential</u>

<u>portion areas are missing, but allowing said any user to view a non-confidential portion of the</u>

<u>presentation</u>,

  Independent claims 30, 38, 39, 40, 41 are directed to systems which include some of the

above limitations but in a system context. Claims 44-47 are directed to computer program

products which recite some of the above limitations.

  No such method, structure, or computer program product in the claimed combination is

taught or suggested by any of the prior art of record, either alone or in combination.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

  A. Pfleeger ("Security in Computing"):

  The Examiner relies on Pfleeger for allegedly anticipating the invention of independent

claims 1, 9, 15, 21, 28, 30, 38-41, and 43-47. Applicant disagrees.

  With regard to independent claims 1, 21, 28, 30, 40, 41, 43, 46, and 47, each of which

recites *"replacing said screen with any confidential areas missing"* or some variation thereof, the

Examiner refers to page 264 ("Break") (see Office Action page 13).

  However, the BREAK key does not teach or suggest the above feature. That is, page 264

(use of the "Break" key) of Pfleeger discloses that "[t]o foil this type of attack, [a Trojan Horse]

the user should be sure the path to the system in reinitialized each time. On some systems,